

¹ Magistrate Judge Steger specifically advised Defendant that she had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive her right to appeal. (Doc. 16 at 5 n.2); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate judge’s factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings”).

determines that the action is frivolous or malicious or fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and (ii). Since the filing of this action, United States District Judge Travis R. McDonough has cautioned Plaintiff regarding her history of repetitive, vexatious, and frivolous filings in this Court. (Case No. 4:17-cv-82, Doc. 5 at 5). To reiterate, Plaintiff Bright is put **ON NOTICE** that her ability to file new lawsuits and documents in this Court may be restricted if she continues to file frivolous or vexatious lawsuits and motions.

Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Steger's findings of fact and conclusions of law. This action is hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** and the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 12) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

SO ORDERED this 16th day of October, 2018.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE